

REMARKS

A new declaration is being prepared by others at Texas Instruments and will be sent if not already sent. In the body of this declaration the present application is identified by application number and filing date and also is identified the EPO 032291079.6. Also provided herewith is a certified copy of the EPO 03291079.6. Applicant requests the benefit of the foreign filing date.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 10- 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 2 and is now deemed to contain statutory subject matter. Claim 1, as amended, calls for “submitting batch or interactive jobs to said server farm on a common resource segment so data input and data output on the server farm remains on the common resource segment; and a display is sent back to appropriate partner’s engagement box and then a remote display at the partner location.” Claim 1, as amended, is deemed to claim patentable subject matter.

Claim 3 is amended to include “submitting batch or interactive jobs to a server on said common resource computing zone so data input and data output on the server on said common resource remains on said common resource computing zone but just a remote display is going back to the engagement box of the partner and then remote display at the partner location.” Claim 3 therefore claims statutory subject matter. Claims 4-7, dependent on claim 3, claim statutory subject matter for at least the same reasons as claim 3.

Claim 10 is amended to call for “means for submitting batch or interactive jobs to a server on said common resource computing zone so data input and data output on the server on said common resource remains on said common resource computing zone but just a remote display is going back to a client device of the partner.” Claim 10, as amended, is now deemed to contain statutory subject matter. Claims 11-13, dependent on claim 10, claim statutory subject matter for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claims 3-6 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Araujo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,920,502; hereinafter Araujo).

Applicant’s claim 3 calls for “providing multiple layers of security to separate isolated engagement boxes for each of the partners in said secure common resource computing zone where the engagement boxes each include a server with an operating system and where partners can work simultaneously, run simulation tests, emulate software problems and share in said secure common resource computing zone with just the a remote display going back to the engagement box of the partner and therefore to the partner outside the owner .”

Araujo describes a remote virtual office that is accessed from many parties to the same working environment (email, file sharing etc...) Applicant describes and claims a complete system that can host multiple parties that will be able to run CPU intensive applications with full segmentation between the parties, while have ability to share expensive compute computers on the common network segment. There is not multiple layers of security in Araujo. There is no separation and isolation of engagement boxes in Araujo. Claim 3 is therefore deemed allowable over the Araujo reference.

Claim 4 -6 dependent on claim 3 are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Claim 4 further calls for “said partners running local applications on said engagement boxes such as design applications, mail, editor, etc. or on a server farm segment that resides on the secure common resource computing zone for bigger batch or interactive jobs.” Claim 5 further calls for “the step of providing a backend segment that includes an intranet access through a firewall to an owner’s intranet.” Claim 6 further calls for “providing an access box for management of all critical boxes in said secure computing zone.” In Araujo there is access to intranet to access applications, accounting, billing, etc. In applicant’s teaching the system can not access Texas Instruments Intranet. They are blocked by the TI firewall 19 with the exception of the Network Time Protocol, license machines for EDA applications and a few mail functionalities.

Claim 10, as amended, calls for “means for providing multiple levels of security to separate isolated engagement boxes for each partner in said secure common resource computing zone where said engagement boxes each include servers with an operating system where the partners can work simultaneously, run simulation tests, emulate software problems or share in said secure common resource computing zone with just a remote display going back to the engagement box of the partner and therefore to the partner outside the owner.”

Araujo describes a remote virtual office that is accessed from many parties to the same working environment (email, file sharing etc...) Applicant describes and claims a complete system that can host multiple parties that will be able to run CPU intensive applications with full segmentation between the parties, while have ability to share expensive compute computers on the common network segment. There are no multiple

layers of security in Araujo. There is no separation and isolation of engagement boxes in Araujo. Claim 10 is therefore deemed allowable over Araujo. Claims 11-13 dependent on claim 10 are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claims 1-2, 7-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Araujo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,920,502; hereinafter Araujo).

Claim 1 calls for “A method for providing secure access of a partner to the development environment of another partner comprising the steps of: starting a VPN tunnel between workstations to establish a secure encrypted tunnel end to end wherein each partner is identified with a different VPN group/password; starting a session by the partner in a Web page on a portal machine that authenticates through LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) the user identification and password of a user; routing the session to an engagement box of a plurality of engagement boxes depending on the user where the engagement box includes a server with an operating system and each of said engagement boxes are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP and wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same engagement box; accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated second LDAP to get benefit of a big compute server farm composed of many high-end servers in a secure way.”

In paragraph [0016] that describes Fig. 1, it references “The access after authentication then communication then passes on to the appropriate isolated engagement box.” Araujo describes how to access office environment, but everybody is sharing the same environment once connected via the SEP, in other words the security of the

environment resides on the security of the file share, or the SEP machine or the client application, so access to file share is possible. According to applicant's claimed invention this is not possible. As shown in Figure 1, every Engine cannot see other engines and access to storage, because of LDAP, is linked to the engagement box (engine). Because the zones are so secure, they help give customers the confidence they need to share design intellectual property with Texas Instruments representatives and subcontractors for the purpose of completing a project and increasing the value of a joint design. Araujo does not provide two levels of security that guarantee the security of intellectual property. There is no first and second DLAP taught or suggest in Araujo. There are no engagement boxes that are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP in Araujo. In Araujo, the SEP will host the session and starts Client applications from it, i.e. all partners will be hosted on the same SEP Web, no routing of sessions to an independent machine is suggested so there is much less security. Claim 1, as amended, is therefore deemed allowable over Araujo. Claim 2 dependent on claim 1 is deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 7, as amended, calls for "starting a VPN tunnel between workstations to establish a secure encrypted tunnel end to end wherein each partner is identified with a different VPN group/password; starting a session by the partner in a Web page on a portal machine that authenticates through LDAP user identification and password of a user; routing the session to an engagement box depending on the user where the engagement boxes are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP and wherein all users of the same

partner are all launching on the same engagement box; said engagement box including a server with an operating system; and accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated second LDAP to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a secure way.”

Claim 7, as amended, includes the multiple LDAP and separated firewall boxes and is therefore deemed allowable over the Araujo reference for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 8, as amended, calls for “means for starting a session by the partner in a Web page on a portal machine that authenticates thru LDAP user identification and password of a user; means for routing the session to an engagement box depending on the person where engagement boxes are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP and wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same engagement box; said engagement box being a server with an operating system; and means for accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated second LDAP to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a secure way.”

Claim 8, as amended, includes the multiple LDAP and separated firewall boxes and is therefore deemed allowable over the Araujo reference for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 8, as amended, is therefore deemed allowable. Claim 9 dependent on claim 8 is deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

Claim 14, as amended, calls for “means for routing the session to an engagement box depending on the person where the engagement boxes are on network segments separated by firewall boxes with another logon/password and is validated thru second LDAP and

wherein all users of the same partner are all launching on the same engagement box; said engagement box including a server with an operating system and means for accessing data and applications from that engagement box on Network File system storage authenticated second LDAP to get benefit of a big compute farm composed of many high-end servers in a secure way.”

Claim 14, as amended, includes the multiple LDAP and separated firewall boxes and is therefore deemed allowable over the Araujo reference for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 14, as amended, is therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of co-pending Application No. 10/615,103 (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0221179). This co-pending application No. 10/615,103 of Omkumar Seshadri was filed in the US on the same date as the present application was filed in the US. It does not claim the benefit of the earlier filed European application. It is only cross referenced since it is in the field of technology of the present invention and is seen as an improvement in the present application wherein a license proxy software is provided that will act as a relay agent and route all the connections from contractor zone into the Intranet. All of the claims in this co-pending Application No. 10/615,103 call for a license proxy in the design zone.

Since there is no other reason for rejection, applicant's amended claims 1-14 ,as amended, are deemed allowable and an early notice of allowance is deemed in order and is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted;

Robert L. Troike
Robert L. Troike (Reg. 24183)

Telephone No.(301) 751-0825